

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWING(S)

Please find enclosed a replacement sheet for Figs. 3 and 4, showing a proposed amendment to Fig. 4 for the approval of the Examiner.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objection has been made to the abstract of the disclosure. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

An amended abstract of the disclosure is enclosed to overcome the objection.

Objection has been made to claim 14. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner, claim 13 has been amended to overcome the objection.

A proposed amendment to Fig. 4, including reference numeral "16" thereon, is shown in the enclosed replacement sheet.

Claims 1-3, 7-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,617,945.

With regard to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 8, the Examiner indicates that Takahashi et al., in Fig. 1, provides for the transfer of the semiconductor devices from the testing position, indicated to be reference numeral 70 in Takahashi et al., to the platform, indicated to be the element inside the thermal wall 54 in Takahashi et al., comprising a turntable, indicated to be reference numeral 12 in Takahashi et al., for offloading, (Office Action, page 3, lines 2, 8-9).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis. It is clear from Fig. 1 and the accompanying description, that the semiconductor devices are not transferred from the testing position 70 to a platform for offloading. Rather, they are transferred from the testing position 70 to the rotation storage arm 16 for offloading at storage buffer section 50, (column 5, line 42 to column 6, line 24). In contrast, independent claim 1 requires the transfer of "the semiconductor devices from the testing position to the platform for offloading," (emphasis supplied).

As far as the contention of the Examiner that the platform of claim 1 is equivalent to an element inside the thermal wall 54 of Takahashi et al. is concerned, it is respectfully submitted that there is no one "element" inside the thermal wall 54, but rather disparate elements including a turntable 12, testing position 70, contact arms 14A, 14B, 14C and, at some positions along the rotation, portions of rotation storage arms 16. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in equating portions of rotation arms 16 in Takahashi et al., as part of an "element" inside the thermal wall 54, to the platform or any part thereof, as claimed in independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that any reasonable construction of the term "platform," as used in

claim 1, and based upon the remainder of the specification, cannot include such structures as rotating arms. Since claims 2-3 and 7-12 are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 1, they are allowable over Takahashi et al. for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1 over Takahashi et al.

Analogously to his analysis of claim 1, the Examiner has indicated that claim 13 is disclosed by Takahashi et al. in Fig. 1, a portion of claim 13 being, in the Examiner's words, "transferring the semiconductor devices (71) from the testing position (70) to the platform; and thereafter moving the semiconductor devices (71) to an offloading position (50) for removal from the platform," (Office Action, page 4, lines 13-15). As previously mentioned in connection with claim 1, there is no transfer of the semiconductor devices from the testing position 70 to a platform, but instead, a transfer is made to the rotation storage arm 16. Since claims 14-15 and 18-20 are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 13, they are allowable over Takahashi et al. for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 13 over Takahashi et al.

Claims 4-6 and 16-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

New independent claim 21 is the same as independent claim 1, except that the "onloading position" of claim 1 has been changed to "onloading position of the platform," the "offloading position" of claim 1 has been changed to "offloading position of the platform," and the transfer of "the semiconductor devices from the testing position to the platform for offloading" of claim 1 has been changed to the transfer of "the semiconductor devices from the testing position to the platform for offloading at the offloading position of the platform." Claim 22 is dependent upon new independent claim 21.

New independent claim 23 is the same as independent claim 13, except that "moving the semiconductor devices along a predetermined path" of claim 13 has been changed to "moving the semiconductor devices on the platform along a predetermined path between the onloading position and offloading position of the platform," and "moving the semiconductor devices to an offloading position for removal from the platform" of claim 13 has been changed to "moving the semiconductor devices to the offloading position for removal from the platform." Claim 24 is dependent upon new independent claim 23.

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 17, 2005:

Max Moskowitz

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

May 17, 2005

Date of Signature

RCF/MIM:lac

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700